



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MEDFORD DISTRICT OFFICE
3040 Biddle Road
Medford, Oregon 97504
email address: or110mb@or.blm.gov

IN REPLY REF: 116)

Bobar Landscape Project EA
A8098(ER:jl)

Dear Interested Citizen:

The Bobar Landscape Project Environmental Assessment (EA) was released in December of 2002. The Bobar Project Planning Area includes Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands in the lower portion of Little Applegate River and the Applegate River-McKee Watersheds. The project focuses on promoting healthy forest ecosystems, reducing wild fire hazard and helping to provide some of the jobs and wood products our community needs through commercial timber sales. Enclosed with this letter is Addendum #1 to the Bobar Landscape Project Environmental Assessment. This addendum introduces an alternative road location for one segment of the proposed road in the northwest corner of the project area. This new proposed location will help respond to the concern of limiting OHV use on BLM land in the project area.

The notice of publication for the Bobar Landscape Project Addendum is expected to be advertised in the Medford Mail Tribune for a 20-day public review period beginning July 30, 2003. If you have comments specific to this new proposal, you may send them to our office. We are not soliciting additional or new comments for the previously released Bobar Landscape Project EA. My staff and I have reviewed the comments received and I will take them into account when making any future decisions.

As you may know, I made a decision in April to move forward with some of the noncommercial oak woodland and shrubland thinning proposed in the Bobar Project EA. Between April 30 and July 11th, about 650 acres of BLM land have been treated in the Bobar project area. Additionally, private landowners were able to treat 55 acres of their land neighboring BLM by acquiring Oregon Dept. of Forestry fuels reduction grants. These treatments will help restore vigor and species diversity to the area while helping to reduce the potential harmful effects of wildfire.

Further information on this proposed project, is available at the Medford District Office, 3040 Biddle Road, Medford, Oregon 97504 or by calling Edward Reilly in the Ashland Planning Department at (541) 618-2384.

The EA and maps are posted on the Medford District web site www.or.blm.gov/medford under Planning Documents/Environmental Assessments.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Drehobl
Field Manager
Ashland Resource Area

Enclosure (as stated)

Addendum to the
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
For
BOBAR LANDSCAPE PROJECT

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MEDFORD DISTRICT
ASHLAND RESOURCE AREA**

EA No. OR-110-02-27 Addendum #1

July, 2003

This addendum to the environmental assessment (EA) for the proposed Bobar Landscape Project was prepared utilizing a systematic interdisciplinary approach integrating the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts with planning and decision making.

Public notice of the availability of this EA addendum was provided through an advertisement in the Medford Mail Tribune.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MEDFORD DISTRICT

EA Addendum COVER SHEET

RESOURCE AREA: Ashland

ACTION/TITLE: Bobar Landscape Project

LOCATION: T.39S.,R.2W., Sections 6,7,19,29-32
T.39S., R3W Sections 1,2,10-15,22-28, 33-36
T.40S.,R.2W., Sections 6,7,19,29-32
Willamette Meridian

EA NUMBER: OR-110-02-27
Addendum #1

List of Preparers	Title	Responsibility
Steve Armitage	Forest Manager	Team Lead
Mark Steiger	Botanist	Special Status Plants
Mark Prchal	Soils Scientist	Soils
Matt Broyles	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animals, Wildlife
Greg Chandler	Fuels Specialist	Fire and Fuels
Jennifer Smith	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries, Riparian
John Samuelson	Forest Engineer	Engineering and Roads
Blair Moody	Forester	Harvest/Logging Systems
Scott Haupt	Silviculturist	Conifer prescriptions, Vegetation
Laurie Lindell Erin Gilbert	Hydrologist	Watershed
Amy Sobiech	Archaeological Technician	Heritage Resources
Edward Reilly	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA Documentation

Bobar Landscape Project

EA No. OR-110-02-27

EA Addendum #1

July, 2003

I. Introduction and Background

This Environmental Assessment (EA) update / addendum evaluates changes to the proposed actions presented in the December 2002 Bobar Landscape Project Environmental Assessment. This update and change has resulted from new project planning considerations identified since the EA was prepared. This document is meant to be used in conjunction with the Bobar Landscape Project EA, issued in December, 2003.

The Bobar Landscape Project was created to address the multiple resource management objectives of maintaining and enhancing forest health, reducing the detrimental effects of wildfire and helping provide jobs and wood products for the local community.

This EA addendum documents and analyzes a change in the transportation plan by analyzing an alternate segment of proposed new road construction. It provides additional assessment of the potential environmental effects of this alternate road location proposal. It also adds an additional Project Design Feature (PDF) to address concerns regarding non-native plant species in the project area.

II. Proposed Action Modifications

The Bobar Landscape Project EA, **Alternative B**, proposed constructing road 39-3-15.1 originating from the Upper Applegate County Road to reach BLM land in Township 39S Range 3W Sections 15, 14 and 23. The total length of the road proposed with Alternative B is 2.4 miles. The proposal outlined in this addendum (introduced in this document as **Alternative D**) offers an alternate route for a segment of the proposed road. This segment would, in part utilize an existing road originating in Section 10 on private land near the mouth of the Little Applegate River. This newly proposed configuration of road is referred to as 39-3-10.0.

The section of road 39-3-15.1 as proposed in Alternative B of the Bobar Landscape EA was approximately 0.8 miles in length. The Alternative D route, road 39-3-10.0, proposed with this EA addendum, is 0.6 miles in length with 0.4 miles on BLM land and 0.2 miles on private land. The net decrease in proposed **new** road construction for the entire length of the road is 0.2 miles. Utilizing the proposed route through private land to access BLM land would require securing an easement from the private land owner. See Bobar EA Addendum Map #1.

The purpose of the road construction is to provide administrative access and to perform long term forest management activities including treating commercial sized conifer (greater than 8 inch DBH), non commercial sized conifer, oak woodland and shrubland vegetation. Commercial timber sales and service contracts are expected to be used to implement the forest management actions. **The treatments proposed, acres and methods remain the same as documented in**

Alternative B of the Bobar Landscape Project EA. With the exception of the changes to road construction presented in this addendum, all other aspects of road construction and road decommissioning remain the same as presented in Alternative B of the Bobar Landscape Project EA.

Table 2-1. Alternative D - Proposed improvement of existing roads in the Bobar Project area.

Road Number	Approximate Length (miles)	Existing Surface: Depth (inches) and Type¹	Control²	Possible Improvements: Depth (inches) and Type³	Seasonal Restriction⁴ (for log hauling)
39-3-10.0A	1.03	4" ASC	PVT	4" ASC	yes

Table 2-2. Alternative D - Proposed new road construction in the Bobar Project area.

Road Number	Approximate Length (miles)	Existing Surface: Depth (inches) and Type¹	Control²	Possible Improvements: Depth (inches) and Type³	Seasonal Restriction⁴ (for log hauling)
39-3-10.0A	.2	-	PVT	8"ASC	yes
39-3-10.0B	1.8	-	BLM	8"ASC Gate	yes

1) ASC = aggregate surface course; - = no improvement

2) BLM = Bureau of Land Management; PVT = Private

3) ASC = aggregate surface course; - = no improvement

4) hauling restricted during wet periods (usually between 10/15 and 5/15)

III. Environmental Consequences

A. Introduction

This chapter focuses on the environmental consequences of changes proposed in this EA addendum. It supplements the environmental consequences discussions in the Bobar Landscape Project EA. The affected environment and the consequences of the action are only discussed here if the resource specialist has determined that an update or additional discussion is appropriate. If the EA's discussion is deemed sufficient, it is not repeated here. The discussion focuses only on site-specific environmental effects resource specialists view as potentially substantive.

B. Site Specific Impacts of the Alternatives

The actions proposed with this addendum as alternative D, are very similar to Alternative B. The change between alternatives is the location of one segment of proposed new road. Because the two actions are so similar the environmental consequences are also similar.

The following convention is used to document changes of material presented in the Bobar Landscape Project EA and the new material provided in this addendum.

~~Strike-through text font~~ – this information is no longer applicable as a result of the change proposed with Alternative D.

Bold italics– this information changed as a result of Alternative D.

Silviculture

No substantive vegetation / silviculture effects have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA.

Fire and Fuels

No substantive fire and fuels effects have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA.

Resource – Soils

Because the new route proposed in Alternative D traverses soils with similar stability and erosion potential characteristics as those described in Alternative B, the environmental consequences of the road building will be quite similar. The new route covers ground that is less steep. No new substantive soils effects have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA.

Resource – Hydrology

The road location proposed with Alternative D substitutes a segment of road from the Applegate McKee sub-drainage into Little Applegate sub-drainage.

Alternative D environmental consequences are the same as those discussed for Alternative B with the following exceptions;

From Hydrology section, page 63 of Bobar Landscape Project EA - Remove the following paragraph under Channel Morphology;

~~Installation of a culvert would have a direct impact on an unnamed tributary to the Applegate River located in drainage area AU0363 (see Table 3.1 for drainage area description). A culvert existed at this site previously but was pulled. The stream channel at this location would change from natural substrate to metal pipe. The unnamed tributary in AU0363 is classed as a long-duration intermittent stream at and below the proposed road crossing and as a perennial interrupted stream upstream of the proposed crossing. The perennial interrupted classification means that there is no surface flow on portions of the stream. There is perennial flow from small seeps upstream of the proposed crossing, but flow goes subsurface above the crossing. The intermittent channel loses any evidence of scour as it enters a high terrace of the Applegate River. Beyond this point, for the last 0.8 miles before the stream flows into the Applegate River, the stream is ephemeral, and evidence of scour or deposition is undetectable. Because of the extremely low gradient of the terrace, distance to the mainstem river, lack of a defined~~

~~channel, and lack of surface flow, there is virtually no chance that there would be any other changes to channel morphology other than at the immediate crossing location.~~

From Hydrology section, page 65 of Bobar Landscape Project EA – Replace and/or remove from the following highlighted text under Indirect Effect – Water Quality;

~~The proposed road construction would occur in stable locations, with the majority on or near ridges, thus minimizing the risk of sediment reaching streams. Road construction would include **10** new drainage crossings on dry draws (draws with no defined channel or no evidence of annual scour and deposition). Drainage structures placed in these drainage ways would disturb the soil, however, the potential for sediment moving downstream is low because they normally have no surface flow even in major flood events. The crossing on the intermittent stream would be located over 0.8 miles above the confluence with the Applegate River. There is a small volume of subsurface perennial flow from small seeps upstream of the proposed crossing, but evidence of year around moisture disappears just above the crossing. The intermittent channel loses any evidence of scour as it enters a high terrace of the Applegate River. Beyond this point, for the last 0.8 miles before the stream flows into the Applegate River, the stream is ephemeral, and evidence of scour or deposition is undetectable. Because of the extremely low gradient of the terrace, distance to the mainstem river, lack of a defined channel, and lack of surface flow, there is virtually no chance that there would be any changes to water quality resulting from this crossing installation. Bankfull width at the stream crossing is 2.7 feet, maximum bankfull depth is 0.5 feet, and the stream channel gradient below the crossing is low (< 1%).~~

From Hydrology section, page 65 of Bobar Landscape Project EA - Replace the following highlighted text in the paragraph under Indirect Effect – Stream Flow;

Road density in the project area would decrease by **1.0** percent, from 4.94 mi/mi² to **4.89** mi/mi², after decommissioning 6.7 road miles (plus an additional 0.5 miles on the same ridge but outside the project area boundary) and constructing **5.8** miles of new roads (Table 4.1). The greatest percent decreases in road density would occur in the 7th level drainage areas AU 0218 (15%), LA 0506 (12%), LA 0509 (11%), and AU 0360 (10%). These drainage areas would be most likely to experience a reduction in frequency and/or magnitude of peak flows due to road decommissioning. The greatest percent increases in road density would occur in the 7th level drainage areas LA 0430 (29%), LA 0503 (15%), and AU 0363 (14%). Impacts on streamflow regime due to road density increases in these drainage areas would most likely be offset by proposed improvements to road drainage that would reduce channelization of runoff, placement of new roads in stable locations generally high on ridges, and decommissioning of problem roads and road stream crossings. The net impact on hydrology in these drainage areas would be no effect or a slight decrease in the frequency and/or magnitude of peak flows due to road construction and decommissioning.

Table 3.1 Project Effects on Road Density - Alternative D

Drainage Area Number	Road Density in Bobar Project Area (mi/mi ²)			Road Density in Total HUC 7 Drainage Area (mi/mi ²)		
	Existing	Alternative D	Percent Change	Existing	Alternative D	Percent Change
AU 0218	4.9	4.2	-15.0	6.6	6.3	-4.2
AU 0360	3.1	2.8	-10.3	4.1	3.9	-6.1
AU 0363	7.1	7.1	0.0	6.5	6.5	0.0
LA 0427	12.4	13.1	5.6	9.7	10.0	2.6
LA 0430	3.0	3.8	29.1	3.5	4.2	21.5
LA 0503	2.9	3.3	14.7	5.3	5.4	2.3
LA 0506	3.9	3.4	-12.0	3.9	3.4	-12.0
LA 0509	3.8	3.4	-10.6	3.8	3.4	-10.6
LA 0542	5.2	5.1	-1.5	5.2	5.1	-1.5
LA 0545	7.1	7.3	3.6	7.1	7.3	3.6
Total	4.9	4.9	-1.0	5.8	5.8	-0.5

*Drainage Areas: **AU 0218**-Applegate River below Beaver Creek, above Star Gulch; **AU 0360**-Applegate River below Star Gulch, above Lime Gulch; **AU 0363**-Applegate River below (and including) Lime Gulch, above Little Applegate River; **LA 0427**-Waters Gulch; **LA 0430**-Yale Creek below Waters Gulch, above Little Applegate River; **LA 0503**-Little Applegate River below Yale Creek, above Grouse Creek; **LA 0506**-Grouse Creek; **LA 0509**-Little Applegate River below Grouse Creek, above Sterling Creek; **LA 0542**-Little Applegate River below Sterling Creek, above drainage area LA 0545; **LA 0545**-Little Applegate River below drainage area LA 0542, above Applegate River. See Table 3.1 for details.

Table 3.2. Watershed Risk Rating – Alternative D

Drainage Area Number	Road Density (mi/mi ²)		Percent of Drainage Area with Stands < 30 years old		% Watershed Relief	Watershed Risk Rating
	Existing	Alternative D	Existing	Alternative D		
AU 0218	6.6	6.3	11	13	21	High
AU 0360	4.1	3.9	6	8	25	High
AU 0363	6.5	6.5	21	22	20	High
LA 0427	9.7	10.0	25	26	16	High
LA 0430	3.5	4.2	5	9	16	High
LA 0503	5.3	5.4	13	13	28	High
LA 0506	3.9	3.4	7	10	17	High
LA 0509	3.8	3.4	6	6	36	High
LA 0542	5.2	5.2	15	19	22	High
LA 0545	7.1	7.1	25	25	28	High

*Drainage Areas: **AU 0218**-Applegate River below Beaver Creek, above Star Gulch; **AU 0360**-Applegate River below Star Gulch, above Lime Gulch; **AU 0363**-Applegate River below (and including) Lime Gulch, above Little Applegate River; **LA 0427**-Waters Gulch; **LA 0430**-Yale Creek below Waters Gulch, above Little Applegate River; **LA 0503**-Little Applegate River below Yale Creek, above Grouse Creek; **LA 0506**-Grouse Creek; **LA 0509**-Little Applegate River below Grouse Creek, above Sterling Creek; **LA 0542**-Little Applegate River below Sterling Creek, above drainage area LA 0545; **LA 0545**-Little Applegate River below drainage area LA 0542, above Applegate River. See Table 3.1 for details.

From Hydrology section, page 77 of Bobar Landscape Project EA – Remove the first sentence from the following paragraph under Watershed Cumulative Effects – Channel Morphology;

~~The one new road stream crossing on an intermittent stream proposed under Alternative B is not expected to result in any cumulative effects on channel morphology.~~ Road decommissioning at stream crossings on federal lands in the project area would remove culverts and allow stream channels to return to their natural form. Road drainage improvements on federal lands would reduce the amount of channel downcutting and streambank erosion that is occurring at culvert outlets. This improvement could be offset by additional road construction involving stream crossings on private lands.

Table 3.3. Cumulative Watershed Risk Rating for Alternative D and Projected Future Management Actions on All Lands.

Drainage Area Number	Road Density (mi/mi ²)		Percent of Drainage Area with Stands < 30 years old		% Watershed Relief	Watershed Risk Rating
	Existing	Alternative D	Existing	Alternative D		
AU 0218	6.6	6.3	11	14	21	High
AU 0360	4.1	3.9	6	8	25	High
AU 0363	6.5	6.5	21	29	20	High
LA 0427	9.7	10.0	25	43	16	High
LA 0430	3.5	4.2	5	17	16	High
LA 0503	5.3	5.4	13	18	28	High
LA 0506	3.9	3.4	7	12	17	High
LA 0509	3.8	3.4	6	10	36	High
LA 0542	5.2	5.1	15	21	22	High
LA 0545	7.1	7.3	25	28	28	High

* Drainage Areas: **AU 0218**-Applegate River below Beaver Creek, above Star Gulch; **AU 0360**-Applegate River below Star Gulch, above Lime Gulch; **AU 0363**-Applegate River below (and including) Lime Gulch, above Little Applegate River; **LA 0427**-Waters Gulch; **LA 0430**-Yale Creek below Waters Gulch, above Little Applegate River; **LA 0503**-Little Applegate River below Yale Creek, above Grouse Creek; **LA 0506**-Grouse Creek; **LA 0509**-Little Applegate River below Grouse Creek, above Sterling Creek; **LA 0542**-Little Applegate River below Sterling Creek, above drainage area LA 0545; **LA 0545**-Little Applegate River below drainage area LA 0542, above Applegate River. See Table 3.1 for details.

Resource – Fisheries

No substantive effects to fisheries resources have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA. NOAA Fisheries was contacted about the newly proposed segment, given a map and project specifics concerning this addendum.

Resource – Wildlife

No substantive effects to wildlife resources have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA. Alternative D's road position provides increased ability to help control use and access. The road position allows greater opportunity to restrict access of motorized vehicles if a wildlife species requires seasonal restriction to motorized traffic.

The proposed action would adversely affect approximately 635 acres of designated Critical Habitat for the northern spotted owl. These acres are in Critical Habitat Unit # OR-75 and are included in the figures shown in table 1 of the wildlife section of Chapter 4 in the Bobar EA. This impact to Critical Habitat was consulted on with the USFWS as part of the Rogue Basin interagency programmatic consultation process for fiscal years 2002 and 2003 projects. Subsequently, the USFWS service issued a Biological Opinion (#1-7-01-F-032) dated Oct 12 2001, which addressed this affect.

Spotted Owl habitat changes in Critical Habitat Unit # OR75 anticipated under the Bobar project.

Current habitat rating		Post-harvest habitat rating	Acres
Suitable	----->	Suitable	499
Suitable	----->	Dispersal	17
Suitable	----->	non-habitat	482
Dispersal	----->	Dispersal	853
Dispersal	----->	Non-habitat	136

Resource – Botany

No substantive effects to botany resources have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA. The proposed road construction route in T39S, R3W, Sections 10 and 15 was surveyed, on 7 May 2003, for the federally listed vascular plant *Fritillaria gentneri* and all Bureau Special Status and Survey and Manage vascular and nonvascular plants known to occur on the Medford BLM District. No federally listed, Bureau Special Status or Survey and Manage vascular or nonvascular plants were found.

Resource – Social Effects

There is a concern that Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) use in the area may contribute to resource damage. The location and position of the road in alternative D is such that access can be more easily controlled than with alternative B. BLM proposes to gate road 39-3-10 as it leaves private land and enters BLM land. The access to the private land is also gated. The decommissioning and gating of road 39-3-27-2 will also help to inhibit off highway vehicles from attempting to travel off road between the terminations of roads 39-3-10 and 39-3-27-2. The road segment proposed with Alternative D is lower down on the ridge and should not be seen as readily by the casual observer driving through the area.

Resource – Heritage

No substantive effects to heritage resources have been identified beyond those already discussed in the Bobar Landscape Project EA. Surveys were performed to identify heritage resources needing protection. None were found.

Project Design Features (PDFs)

For action alternatives B & D– add to the existing PDFs:

Approximately 28 acres of star thistle populations have been identified within or adjacent to proposed treatment units. To reduce the potential spread of noxious weeds in the project area, hand pulling of star thistle will take place in these areas prior to any cutting of vegetation or ground disturbance. Treated areas will be surveyed one year after treatment to assess the need for further weed removal activities.